



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,323	07/13/2001	Kurt R. Marko	10006139-1	6749
7590	12/01/2006		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			BEKERMAN, MICHAEL	
Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 272400				
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			3622	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/905,323	MARKO, KURT R.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Bekerman	3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 10 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 10 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to papers filed on 9/18/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. **Claims 1 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Regarding claims 1 and 15, these claims recite the limitation "select[ing] a coupon from the coupon set and a characteristic of the coupon based on expected value of the coupon". It is unclear as to how this statement should be read. Is the coupon selected from either the coupon set or "the characteristic of the coupon"? And if so, what does this mean? Read a different way, is only the characteristic of the coupon based on expected value? Read a different way once again, are both the characteristic and coupon selection based on the expected value?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 1-4, 7, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linden (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,505) in view of Herz (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,279).**

Regarding claims 1-4, 7, and 15-18, Linden teaches the identifying of items in a current transaction, the targeting and selecting of coupons based on those items, and the printing of those coupons on the back of a receipt (Column 30, Lines 59-61 and Column 31, Lines 1-9). Linden does not specify a method of selecting the coupons based on expected value. Herz teaches a system of targeting coupons to users based on a profit maximizing strategy (Column 23, Lines 56-58) in which coupons are selected for the user by predicting which coupons will best support the vendor's marketing strategy (Column 23, Lines 56-64). The system of Herz also takes into account user purchases (Column 22, Lines 64-67) and prints the coupon (Column 24, Lines 12-14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the current-transaction targeted coupons of Linden with the profit-maximizing coupons of Herz. This will aid in the retention of customers while simultaneously maximizing the profit for the retailer. By determining which coupons to print, the system inherently performs priority ranking. As the expected value changes, the coupon appearance changes (Herz, Column 24, Lines 34-36). When the appearance of the coupon changes, the pixels that are printed on the paper are rearranged and thus, the characteristic positioning and orientation of the pixels are changed.

Regarding claims 19 and 20, Herz teaches the keeping track of coupon usage (Column 22, Lines 64-67 and Column 23, Line 1) and using past purchase history as well as profit-maximization to select coupons (Column 24, Lines 22-24 and Lines 34-36).

2. Claims 5, 6, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linden (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,505) in view of Herz (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,279), and further in view of DeLapa (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,068).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, neither Linden nor Herz specify a choosing the number of coupons based on quantity of items purchased or total purchase price. DeLapa teaches printing more coupons for households with more accumulative purchases (the more items that are bought, the higher the total purchase price will be) (Column 5, Lines 18-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide more coupons to consumers who purchase more items, and thereby, the consumers get rewarded for retailer loyalty.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, neither Linden nor Herz specify changing the appearance of the coupons based on quantity of items purchased or total purchase price. DeLapa teaches a targeted coupon printing method in which household-specific messages may be printed with the coupons (thus changing the appearance). When the appearance of the coupon changes, the pixels that are printed on the paper are rearranged and thus, the characteristic positioning and orientation of the pixels are changed. The messages are determined according to household characteristics, and

those household characteristics include accumulative purchases (the more items that are bought, the higher the total purchase price will be) (Column 5, Lines 18-22 and Column 13, Lines 42-53). It is unclear whether DeLapa intends for the message to be printed on the coupon, or on a separate page enclosed in the coupon packaging, however it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to print the message on the coupon itself in the interest of saving paper.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Bekerman whose telephone number is (571) 272-3256. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric W. Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MB



JEFFREY D. CARLSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER